

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN
SOUTHERN DIVISION

ANTHONY MICHAEL MOSS,

Case No. 1:08-CV-311

Petitioner,

v.

Hon. Richard Alan Enslen

CAROL HOWES,

ORDER

Respondent.

This matter is before the Court on Petitioner Anthony Michael Moss' *pro se* letter motion of July 6, 2008. The Court reads *pro se* filings indulgently. *See Haines v. Kerner*, 404 U.S. 519, 520 (1972). As such, the Court concludes that Petitioner's letter is properly characterized as a Motion for Reconsideration of the Court's Order of Dismissal dated June 26, 2008.¹ (*See* Dkt. No. 11 ("Per this letter I am respectfully requesting Your Honor . . . allow my habeas petition to proceed only on the five issues that were exhausted.").) Pursuant to Western District of Michigan Local Civil Rule 7.4(a), reconsideration is appropriate only when the movant "demonstrate[s] a palpable defect by which the Court and the parties have been misled . . . [and] that a different disposition must result from the correction thereof." Petitioner has presented no new arguments in his Motion for Reconsideration. Accordingly, the Court discerns no palpable defects.

THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Petitioner Anthony Michael Moss' Motion for Reconsideration (Dkt. No. 12) is **DENIED**.

DATED in Kalamazoo, MI:
August 11, 2008

/s/ Richard Alan Enslen
RICHARD ALAN ENSLEN
SENIOR UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

¹Before requesting reconsideration, Petitioner suggests the Court did not consider Petitioner's Addendum to Objection filed on June 18, 2008. (*See* Dkt. No. 10.) Petitioner is simply wrong. In the Court's Order of Dismissal, the Court clearly indicated it "has also considered Petitioner's Addendum to Objection filed on June 18, 2008." (Dkt. No. 11 n.1.)